DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 357 686 HE 026 433

AUTHOR	Hexter, Holly
TITLE	A Description of Federal Information and Outreach Programs and Selected State, Institutional and Community Models. Symposium on Information Resources, Services, and Programs. Background Paper Number Three.
INSTITUTION	Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	May 90
NOTE	75p.; For related documents, see HE 026 428-443.
PUB TYPE	Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Achievement; *Access to Education; *Economically Disadvantaged; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Higher Education; Intervention; *Minority Group Children; Program Descriptions; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; *School Community Programs; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Arizona; California; Mississippi; New York; Ohio; Texas; TRIO Programs; Washington; Wisconsin

ABSTRACT

This paper describes state, institutional, and other community-based programs deemed exemplary (on the basis of design imperatives) for successful interventions to promote meaningful access of minority group youth to postsecondary education. The imperatives include early intervention, comprehensive and integrated intervention, intervention sustained for ongoing feedback and tracking, coordination with other education and training programs, and broad and long-term strategies providing a continuum of age-appropriate services. Following a general introduction, chapter 2, on state programs, describes programs developed by Arizona, Ohio, California, Texas, New York, Wisconsin, Washington, and Mississippi. Chapter 3 describes association and institutional programs including: "Syracuse Challenge," which provides support services to students from sixth grade on; "Middle College High School," an alternative high school housed in a New York City community college; "Career Beginnings," which uses a "case management" approach beginning in the high school junior year; "Mathematics, Engineer, Sciences Achievement," a program that encourages California minority students in grades 3-12 in these areas; and the "Hispanic Student Success Program" in San Antonio (Texas). Chapter 4 describes community-based programs like the "I Have a Dream" program, which began as a pledge by philanthropist of Eugene Lang to provide college tuition to Harlem sixth graders and later turned into a national foundation. Chapter 5 outlines federal programs, particularly the "Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds" effort. Chapter 6 draws conclusions and suggests recommendations. (Includes 16 endnotes.) (JB)

ED357686

SYMPOSIUM ON INFORMATION RESOURCES, SERVICES, AND PROGRAMS

Background Paper Number Three

A Description of Federal Information and Outreach Programs And Selected State, Institutional and Community Models

May 1990

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance

HE026433

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

A Description of Federal Information and Outreach Programs And Selected State, Institutional and Community Models

Holly Hexter
Consultant

Prepared for the

Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance

May 1990

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: STATE PROGRAMS	7
CHAPTER 3: ASSOCIATION AND INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS	23
CHAPTER 4: COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS	37
CHAPTER 5: FEDERAL PROGRAMS	45
CHAPTER 6: CONCLUSION	67
ENDNOTES	75

Over the last 20 years, then, trends in federal funding reflect the belief that cost constitutes the primary barrier to higher education for disadvantaged youth, and that the emphasis on financial assistance would bring minority participation rates closer to parity with those of the majority population. Through the mid-1970's, the rise in minority enrollments appeared to confirm the effectiveness of that strategem. However, despite the continued expansion of federally supported student aid, college participation of minority youth from low-income families, particularly males, declined sharply between 1976 and 1986.[2]

The dimensions of the problem surrounding access to higher education for disadvantaged youth are now widely acknowledged; some of the factors are no less obscure. The previous background paper has documented the importance of early information about the academic and financial commitments necessary for college as well as the paucity of such information that students and parents now receive. Certainly, the lack of information, or inadequate information, about the availability of student financial aid poses a major barrier to the postsecondary participation of disadvantaged students.

Our review also makes clear, however, that even when appropriately delivered, information alone is insufficient to ensure access for these families. Students who lack the motivation and academic foundation for college work and whose families are unpersuaded of the values of postsecondary education are unlikely candidates for

CHAPTER 1

STATE PROGRAMS

The "Great Society" programs of the 1960s, with their emphasis on the link between education and economic opportunity, established the federal government as the guarantor of access to higher education. From the beginning, the federal strategy was dualistic--to provide student financial assistance to meet college costs, as well as to offer the support services that would enable eligible students to take advantage of such assistance. The elements of this strategy were seen as complementary; the student loan and grant programs aimed to close the gap between family income and college costs, while information and outreach were necessary to inform students and their families about college requirements and the sources and availability of financial aid.

Since 1972, when the Basic Educational Opportunity Grants (now Pell Grants) program was established, the federal investment in student aid has increased substantially--from $2.1 billion to more than $18 billion today. [1] Even in constant dollars, federal support has tripled. The commitment to information and outreach services has been more equivocal. Federal spending for the so-called TRIO programs has risen in current dollars from about $70 million in the early 1970's to $241 million today and has actually decreased in real terms.

college. We know, too, that, in many urban areas, poor, minority students drop out of school well before the onset of many college planning or outreach programs, rendering such efforts "too little, too late."

As testimony to the committee concluded,

> [T]he social and economic dilemmas facing most of our nation's at-risk students require that we go beyond just making information available to them. In short, increasing the participation of at-risk students in education will require comprehensive, coordinated interventions over time in which all members of education, business, government and the community are partners.[3]

Knowledge of these circumstances, coupled with the experience of researchers and advocates, suggests several imperatives for the design of successful interventions to promote meaningful access to postsecondary education:

- The interventions must begin early; it is generally agreed that the middle school grades are crucial, both developmentally and in terms of academic planning;

- The interventions must be comprehensive and integrated; services provided should include supplemental instruction, counseling, mentoring and help with study skills, as well as information about career options, college admissions and financial aid and assistance in completing test, application and financial aid forms;

- The interventions must be sustained enough to provide ongoing feedback and tracking of the students who participate at each educational level;

- The interventions must be coordinated with other education and training programs at the local, state and federal level that target low-income and/or disadvantaged youth, and

- The interventions must be broad and long-term, providing a continuum of age-appropriate services from the middle school grades through college, and engage the efforts of all interested community partners, including schools, colleges and universities, businesses and community groups.

More specifically, the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA) and the American Council on Education (ACE) have identified essential components of a "successful early awareness intervention" that include early parent and childhood education; parent and guardian involvement; an academic component; efforts to build self-esteem and aspirations for success through education; mentoring and role model relationships; the involvement of admissions, financial aid, and other student services staff of higher education institutions; guidance about academic preparation for the next level of study; and an evaluation component that includes longitudinal studies of program participants.[4]

This paper selectively explores state, institutional, and other community-based programs deemed exemplary on the basis of the design imperatives cited above. Descriptions of these programs will include basic background information on the structure of the program and the range of services provided, as well as the program outcomes, if available. The paper then describes the legislative histories and program designs of the federal programs. Finally, it asks how, in light of the other models presented, the federal role might be modified.

A few caveats are in order. In assessing the state and local programs, it is important to note that few existing programs are sufficiently comprehensive to meet all of the design criteria cited above; the programs that have been selected for mention include some but not all of the necessary elements. Furthermore, many of these initiatives are new and have not been evaluated; thus they may not have an established track record. With regard to the federal government, most of the succeeding discussion focuses on the TRIO programs, which historically have been the mainstay of the federal information and outreach programs. No less important, although they serve many fewer students, are the so-called HEP/CAMP programs that provide financial and other assistance to migrant students.

CHAPTER 2

STATE PROGRAMS

Historically, the states have borne the responsibility for supporting higher education. The purposes of state student aid programs have largely matched those of the federal programs by promoting equal access to higher education for all, especially lower-income groups. That stake has risen significantly in recent years, as witnessed by the growth of state need-based grant and scholarship programs. In 1989-90, states are expected to award almost $2.1 billion in grant aid to more than 1.7 million students. Most of that is need-based aid directed to undergraduates.[5]

Compared to the total amount allocated to student financial aid, state grant agencies spend a small amount to inform students about the availability of such aid and/or college opportunities. On average, the 38 states surveyed by the National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs (NASSGP) spent the equivalent of less than 0.3 percent of their grant dollars on "information dissemination."[6] (In the main, the state information and outreach programs described below operate outside the state granting agencies, although some, such as New York and Wisconsin, are linked closely to grant and scholarship programs.)

Declines in college-going among many minority youth have caused states with well-established "access" programs to intensify their efforts; others for the first time are attempting to coordinate activities to recruit, retain and graduate larger numbers of minority students. In the view of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO), which has analyzed recent state responses, narrowly focused approaches to access and retention prevail. Two states--Arizona and Ohio--appear to have a comprehensive, statewide plan that identifies and attempts to fill gaps in the entire educational pipeline. Neither plan has been fully funded or implemented. These limitations notwithstanding, early information and outreach programs in several states provide useful models. These programs are notable either for the scope of services provided, an established track record in targeting a disadvantaged population, or for innovations in resources, methods, or partners deployed in the program.

The following section describes the Arizona and Ohio plans, with emphasis on their early information and outreach components, as well as selected early awareness and intervention programs in California, Texas, New York, Wisconsin and Washington State. An initiative in Mississippi is also described.

Arizona

The Arizona Minority Education Access and Achievement Cooperative is a voluntary association of the schools, community colleges and the three public higher education systems that have agreed to work together to increase minority access and retention. With funding from the Ford Foundation, Arizona this year awarded small grants to seven pilot outreach projects that address various levels of minority education. Among them are mentorship programs with local middle schools; a program to bring additional Native American students into the life sciences; a program to bring minority students into teaching; and programs that involve tutoring and summer "bridge" programs for secondary school students. All represent partnerships of at least two of the three partners among schools, community colleges, and the universities. A request for future funding for such initiatives is pending before the legislature.

Meanwhile, members of the cooperative are drafting a "compact" on minority achievement that will set specific goals for minority achievement and commit the governing boards to plan and allocate resources for preparing minority students for college. The compact will be endorsed by the State Board of Education, the State Board of Community Colleges, and the Arizona Board of Regents this summer, and will then be sent out to the state's roughly 200 school boards and 11 community college boards.

Ohio

After a 1988 policy study of the Ohio Board of Regents outlined educational, financial, cultural and structural barriers to participation in higher education, the Regents adopted a set of intersegmental goals and strategies targeting minority students that would involve schools, colleges, government agencies and the private sector. Early information and intervention efforts are seen as crucial components of strategies to broaden access and boost retention, and they are to be carried out by a "widely-ranging Urban and Non-Urban Postsecondary Education Demonstration Program ... designed to improve the preparation for postsecondary education of at-risk youth and adults and assertively to draw them into the postsecondary education system ..."[7]

By consolidating existing programs and designing new interventions, each "Postsecondary Education Demonstration Laboratory" would provide, among other things:

- An "early introduction to [the] education ethic, college opportunities and financial aid" at the upper elementary or middle school level;

- Special assistance in academic preparation through summer, evening or weekend programs;

- A search for additional sources of student aid or improved packaging of aid for low-income students, and

- Ongoing assessment of the results as students move through the system.

Notwithstanding the success of the federal TRIO programs, "we realized that we have to expand far beyond what TRIO does," according to Ann Moore, Regents vice president for planning and organizational development. "We have to start much earlier with kids in terms of motivation and providing some models for success. If we work only at the junior and senior [year] levels, the pipeline's going to close down.

"Our goal here in Ohio is trying to get schools, colleges and the private sectors to fill the gaps in the education pipeline," Moore says. All higher education institutions have been required to "take inventory" of their information and outreach programs to identify needs that are not being met. The Regents have sent to the legislature a proposal for the collaborative "demonstration labs," but no funds have yet been appropriated.

Texas's Youth Opportunities Unlimited

Youth Opportunities Unlimited (Y.O.U.) is a dropout prevention program that underwrites a summer work-study experience for disadvantaged 14- and 15-year-old high school students. Each summer, about 2,000 students, mostly black or Hispanic, spend eight weeks on one of 21 campuses throughout the state. The students attend math, reading, writing, and language courses half the day and work the rest; they are paid the minimum wage for 20 hours of actual work and for five hours of career counseling. The $9 million in funding is provided by the U.S. Labor Department under Title IIB of the Job Partnership Training Act (JPTA), and the program is coordinated by the Texas Department of Commerce, the Higher Education Coordinating Board, the Texas Education Agency, and the 34 service delivery areas of Private Industry Councils (PICs). The 21 colleges and universities receive grants to administer the program at an approximate cost of $3,260 per participant.

The six-year-old program is based on a model begun at St. Edward's University (TX) aimed at helping children of migrant workers succeed in college. Now seven other states--Washington, Louisiana, Kentucky, Arkansas, Illinois, South Carolina and Colorado--have replicated the model. YOU has both academic and work experience components. Says director Daisy Diaz-Alemany, "Employment is the hook. What we're

doing is turning these kids into consumers who want to go to college so they can make money. But first, the biggest barrier is to get them into a track so that they can aspire to go."

Important features of the program, according to Diaz-Alemany, are the small class size (teacher-student ratio of 1:5), parental involvement (parents spend one weekend on campus at the program's expense) and the experience, new to most participants, of being totally immersed in a community at least 50 miles from home. Almost all students enrolled complete the YOU program, and of those, most receive academic credit for their summer work. Texas has had difficulty tracking YOU participants after they leave the program, although anecdotal reports suggest YOU has been effective in keeping participants in school. And at least one of the summer hosts, Texas Tech University, "picks up" some YOU students for participation in the local Upward Bound program. To date, 7,800 eighth- or ninth-graders have participated in YOU.

California's CAL-SOAP

The state of California sponsors two dozen outreach and access programs aimed at ethnic minority and low-income students. Two of the outreach programs are administered by the University of California--the UC Early Outreach Program, and the

Mathematics Engineering, Sciences Achievement (MESA) Program (see Chapter III). The California Student Aid Commission administers the third, the California Student Opportunity and Access Program, which is commonly referred to as CAL-SOAP. At least 30,000 students in grades 7 through 12 each year benefit from a range of information, academic, and counseling services provided by CAL-SOAP. A typical local program is difficult to describe, since the programs are administered by six education consortia of schools and colleges serving different regions of the state, and local project directors have great discretion to design programs as they see fit. All programs, however, share the goals of "improving the flow of information about postsecondary education and financial aid, and raising the achievement levels of students historically underrepresented in postsecondary education--both low-income and ethnic students."

Direct services may include: tutoring in English, math, science, and study skills; individual and group counseling; meetings and seminars for parents and students on college admissions and financial aid, and career information and goal-setting activities. Contact with students "is almost never a one-shot deal," according to Daniel Parker of the California Student Aid Commission. CAL-SOAP complements rather than duplicates local efforts, Parker says. If the local CAL-SOAP project identifies adequate tutoring, counseling, or information services in the area, the project may operate as a clearinghouse to refer students to appropriate services. This local flexibility is seen as crucial in avoiding either overlaps of or gaps in services.

Since the inception of CAL-SOAP in 1978, the amount of state and matching funds has expanded considerably. Each state dollar is matched by up to 1.5 local dollars. In 1988-89, $577,000 in state appropriations and roughly $800,000 in matching funds was available for the program. The focus of the program has also shifted: Although it initially targeted 11th and 12th graders, "in the last 10 years, CAL-SOAP has learned along with everyone else that for many kids that's not early enough," Parker says. "Since the first big fallout [of students] occurs between junior and senior high school, it makes sense to go back and intervene there." Two years ago CAL-SOAP sought and received additional appropriations from the legislature to extend the program to junior high or middle school students, and now all six projects are required to have services in place for these students.

CAL-SOAP maintains listings of participants and has tracked them to demonstrate the effectiveness of the program. In 1986, for instance, California could show that the college-going rates of CAL-SOAP seniors compared favorably with the statewide rate for high school graduates---66 percent of program participants and 57.8 percent of all high school graduates were college bound. Although Dan Parker admits that the state and local programs together serve a "relatively small" percentage of the eligible population, the fact that such interventions succeed at a fairly low cost is

significant. Given the economic and cultural barriers, "individual interventions that succeed in getting a student into a legitimate course of postsecondary study are a hell of an accomplishment," he says.

New York's Liberty Partnership Program

Beginning in the 1991-92 academic year, New York State will augment its Tuition Assistance Program with an entitlement program to cover nontuition costs for students from low-income families. When fully phased in by 1994-95, New York expects to award Liberty Scholarships to about 90,000 students per year. In tandem with the aid program, an outreach program called the Liberty Partnership Program this year awarded grants totalling $10 million to 42 projects for counseling and support services for "at-risk" youth. Most of the projects are being run by colleges and universities in cooperation with local schools and community agencies. This year, the first year of operation, they are reaching some 10,000 students.

The Liberty Partnership Program's focus is dropout prevention: it aims "to keep 'at risk' students in school and enable them to graduate so they can take advantage of the scholarship program," according to Jeanine Grinage of the New York State Education Department, which administers the program.

As in other outreach programs of this sort, the schools identify students most at risk of dropping out, and students apply to participate. The range of services local projects provide reflect the factors most frequently cited for high dropout rates: teenage pregnancy, poor attendance, substance abuse, low academic achievement, etc. There is no ethnicity or income requirement; the program defines "at risk" on the basis of academic performance, school attendance, and limited English proficiency. Both the timing of the outreach efforts and the scope of those efforts are left up to the local institutions. But all projects must include the following components: testing; tutoring; counseling (career, financial aid, college selection, psychological guidance); parental involvement; home visitations, and use of local volunteer services.

The information given students focuses on postsecondary education and careers. Students are informed about requirements for college coursework, financial aid applications and the availability of financial aid, as well as career options. The Higher Education Services Corporation, which administers TAP and other state aid, provides all Liberty Partnership participants with information about qualifying for Liberty Scholarships.

The Liberty Partnership Program will be phased in over four years. Because it is so new, the state has only anecdotal information about improved attendance and

attitudes among participants and the beneficial effects of parental involvement. Already, however, Grinage says, "we're looking to restructure the program to broaden its impact. We'd like to use the same resources to reach an even larger population."

Wisconsin's Talent Search and Early Identification Programs

Wisconsin took over the federally funded Talent Search program in the Milwaukee area and incorporated TS into a range of financial aid and outreach activities known as the Wisconsin Educational Opportunity Program, administered by the state Department of Public Instruction. The state's Talent Incentive Program provides supplementary grants to reduce the self-help portion of college costs for needy students; Talent Search provides information and counseling to 12th graders, and the Early Identification Program targets students in grades 8 through 12.

The Early Identification Program aims to reduce dropout rates and to orient students to educational and career goals as early as the eighth grade. Each year about 240 eighth graders are chosen from the Milwaukee and Racine areas and 100 from elsewhere in the state. Teachers, counselors and administrators select students in the following groups: "high potential" students with grade point averages of 3.0 to 4.0; "marginal" students with a GPA of between 2.0 and 3.0, and "probationary" students, who demonstrate potential but lack motivation. Students and parents accepted into the

program agree, among other things, that the student will participate in the program for four years and will take college preparatory courses. In addition to ongoing counseling, academic advising, and tutoring, the program offers regularly scheduled workshops on such topics as career opportunities, self-esteem, and financial aid. Program staff help place students in part-time jobs and in summer precollege programs. Parental involvement is judged important, and if necessary, program staff make home visits to sustain contact with the program.

"Eighth grade is as crucial for high school as 12th grade is for college," says WEOP administrator LaVerne Jackson-Harvey. "What we do is catch them in the 8th grade and give them some skills and educate them about their options." Once students reach their senior year, they are "picked up" by Talent Search, which focuses more directly on choosing a particular college and learning about available student aid, Jackson-Harvey says.

Washington State's College Opportunities Mentorship Program (COMP)

The Washington legislature in 1988 enacted a resolution urging the creation of community service outreach programs that would use existing state Work-Study and federal State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) funds. As a result, the state's Higher

Education Coordinating Board and other agencies established four community service initiatives, including a summer jobs and study program based on YOU in Texas and the College Opportunities Mentorship Program, otherwise known as COMP.

COMP was conceived by the coordinating board and Heritage College, a small college in the Yakima Valley, as a way of using student mentors to raise the educational aspirations of residents in the Hispanic and American Indian communities. This year, the third of the program, 10 student mentors will reach about 2,500 youth through visits to schools, homes and through participation in tribal activities. Under supervision of an academic dean and a student coordinator, students provide information about financial aid and college admissions requirements and provide "inspiration by telling their story" of academic success, according to Betty Fallihee of the Higher Education Coordinating Board. Student presentations make use of state-developed information on the availability of state and federal student financial assistance.

This pilot project is notable for the combined use of SSIG and Work-Study funds to support educational outreach. The college also receives a small ($6,000) grant to administer the project. Although COMP's original target was junior high students, the mentorship program has also drawn high marks from adults.

Mississippi's Project '95

Project '95, Mississipi's six-year plan to raise education standards at all levels, sets forth three principal goals: improving the skills of teachers in the public schools, enhancing access to university programs for black students, and increasing high school graduation and college admissions requirements. It operates with private funds as a collaborative between the three governing boards--the state board of education, the junior and community college board, and the college and university board. Among the components of Project '95 are regional financial aid workshops aimed at parents and high school students and the implementation of a Career Beginnings program (a national college-school-business partnership that emphasizes mentorship program; see Chapter III) at five sites in Mississippi.

The plan is not without controversy; indeed not all three partners agree completely on all strategies, according to Project '95 Director James Hutto. Nevertheless, Hutto says, if a major barrier to access is the failure to be enrolled in precollege courses, requiring schools to offer those courses should help minority students. "We're saying you can raise standards and broaden access at the same time."

CHAPTER 3

ASSOCIATION AND INSTITUTIONAL PROGRAMS

The nation's colleges and universities have regarded with dismay the declining participation of minorities and the failure to retain minority students who do participate. In issuing One Third of a Nation, the American Council on Education and the Education Commission of the States exhorted educators to strengthen minority recruitment and retention and to better coordinate interventions throughout the educational system.[8] In 1989, ACE and the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, in defining a national agenda for early awareness and outreach programs, urged a "certainty of opportunity" for minority students that would ensure academic success and preparation for college and jobs. Certainty of Opportunity explicitly acknowledged that in the absence of comprehensive early interventions in the lives of at-risk students, later recruitment and retention efforts are irrelevant.[9]

As NASFAA and ACE noted, national organizations and local institutions, working in tandem with schools, businesses and other community-based groups, have launched numerous projects that provide interventions for disadvantaged students. Colleges and universities are favorably positioned to act as local hosts and sponsors. They serve as "neutral partners" that can draw the school and business communities together. They have the capacity to link a range of community-based services with

different but related objectives. And, too, situating programs on a campus helps accomplish a major task of many college preparatory outreach programs--to acculturate student participants to college life.

Many of the institutional efforts are minimally supported, rely on the resources and good will of volunteers and are largely reactive interventions. Like the federal and state efforts previously described, many lack followthrough mechanisms or evaluation components that would readily assess their effectiveness. Nevertheless, an informal survey reveals a number of programs and initiatives that have been replicated nationwide or have "leveraged" wider scale interventions. Not all can be described here.

Some of the initiatives are best described as informational projects in which the role of the national association consists mainly in development and dissemination of material to its constituency. Among them are:

- "Paving the Way," a videotape and set of informational materials developed by the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities (NAICU) that have been used by schools, institutions and associations nationwide to provide parents with basic information about preparation for college. Since 1986, NAICU has distributed 150,000 booklets and 1,500 videotapes nationwide.

- Parents and Counselors Together (PACT), a training guide developed by the National Association of College Admissions Counselors for counselors to use in presenting parent workshops "that promote educational success with students." Modules include information on the foundations of academic success and routes to postsecondary education, which are aimed at parents of junior high students, and more specific information on the postsecondary transition, college application process, and college financing options for parents of high school students. The association has since distributed about 2,000 copies, in part through 10 dissemination workshops offered in 10 cities. The project is being funded by the Edna McConnell Clark Foundation.

More comprehensive programs target a wide age span and provide a range of enrichment, counseling, mentoring and informational experiences. Most of these have been replicated in a number of sites. The sections that follow describe a few of such programs: the NASFAA Early Awareness Project; the Career Beginnings program based at Brandeis University; the Hispanic Student Success Program sponsored by the Hispanic Assocation of Colleges and Universities; the Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement program based at the University of California at Berkeley; La Guardia Community College's Middle College High School, and the Syracuse (University) Challenge.

NASFAA Early Awareness Project

A NASFAA minority concerns committee concluded in 1986 that much more had to be done to provide early information about college and financial planning to disadvantaged students. On the basis of the committee's recommendations, NASFAA sponsored local collaboratives in a dozen cities--including Boston, Detroit, Cleveland and Miami--with large numbers of at-risk students. Some cities, such as Cleveland, already had programs underway that pooled the resources of schools, colleges, businesses and foundations. NASFAA's role as a national association provided an imprimatur of credibility for the aid administrators working at a local level. The association also developed and made available to the local projects two sets of brochures--one aimed at junior high students and their parents, and a more detailed version outlining financial aid information for high school students--in both English and Spanish. In setting up the projects, NASFAA relied "almost exclusively on volunteers to draw upon the resources of their own institutions or to get resources from the community," according to Tim Christensen, NASFAA director of research and marketing.

Although the projects vary from city to city, they all contain elements cited in a NASFAA/ACE symposium as crucial ingredients of an effective intervention program--parental involvement, mentoring, building of self-esteem, an academic component,

counseling and guidance, and the involvement of admissions, financial aid, and other student services staff from postsecondary institutions.[10] NASFAA continues to monitor the projects, which have become institutionalized in different ways. In Cleveland, the project has been attached to the long-established Cleveland Scholarship Program (see Chapter IV). Efforts in Detroit are aided by state funding for early intervention programs, particularly for the Martin Luther King-Cesar Chavez-Rosa Parks College Days Program, which orients junior high students to campus life during a brief summer session.

In 1988 NASFAA conducted a survey of the membership and of other education associations to develop a compendium of early information and outreach programs.[11] The association currently plans to expand and update the directory of more than 70 programs.

The Syracuse Challenge

Syracuse University in 1988 established a partnership with the Syracuse school district in which it guaranteed admission and full financial aid to all students who successfully complete the "Syracuse Challenge." In the first three years, about 2,700 students have participated in the program, and the first group is expected to graduate

in the spring of 1991. If all the participating seniors qualify, Syracuse could expect to extend unconditional offers of admission to more than 900 students next year. It will have no trouble meeting the program goal of reaching 3,600 students by 1992.

Most significant, to Bill Boney, is that the Challenge is part of "a comprehensive approach. We've established a continuum that begins in sixth grade." Syracuse 6th and 7th graders can enroll in "pre-Challenge," a summer program that focuses on boosting skill in science and math; many of these students then participate in STEP, a state-run academic year program, followed by admission into "Challenge" as 8th or 9th graders. Boney says students who attend Syracuse have a network of undergraduate support services, including an internship that provides research experiences for prospective graduate students. In addition, Syracuse guarantees former "Challenge" students with at least a 2.5 GPA average admission and full financial aid to any graduate or professional program within the university. All the programs are administered by the office of the vice president for undergraduate studies; this organization, as Boney notes, fosters a "unitary" approach, since the program design, administration, and monitoring are carried out by a single division.

Middle College High School

A 15-year-old "alternative high school" housed at La Guardia Community College has reversed the track record of failure of at-risk students. About 85 percent of Middle College students, who are culled from those with the poorest academic and attendance records in area high schools, graduate from high school (compared with 60 percent in all New York City schools) and most of these go on to some form of postsecondary education. The Middle College model has since been replicated in other parts of the City University of New York system and in seven communities across the country, including Memphis, Tucson, Tampa, Fla., and Flint, Mich.

Several factors account for Middle College's success where regular schools have failed, according to Janet Lieberman, the La Guardia administrator who designed the model:

- Its presence on a college campus and its design as a collaborative;

- Heavy emphasis on guidance and group counseling and a higher-than-average ratio of counselors to students;

- Small size (fewer than 500 students) that permits "institutionalized caring" by teachers and staff;

- Work component that involves students in unpaid work in social service settings one-third of the year;

- High standards that include expectations for college and the opportunity to take college-level work in high school;

- Flexible pacing that allows students to graduate when they have accumulated sufficient credit (on average, four and a half years), and

- Freedom and responsibility.

Although information about college and financial aid opportunities is provided formally, the school's presence on a college campus "creates information immediately," according to Lieberman. "Kids use the college facilities, they see neighbors who are enrolled, and they know it can be done. College becomes accessible to them."

Career Beginnings

The Career Beginnings Program is a business, college and community initiative designed to build a career support system for teenagers from disadvantaged

backgrounds. Begun four years ago with support from the Commonwealth Fund, the program was modeled on a mentorship program at Hunter College. Career Beginnings now operates on 25 campuses in 22 cities and has recruited almost 10,000 students; some 7,000 participants in the program have graduated, and of that group, 70 percent have gone on to college.

Although the program design varies slightly from site to site, all share Career Beginnings' four major components: an extensive "case management" system that tracks student progress from the junior year through the first year after high school graduation; at least two academic enrichment activities, one of which is located on the host campus; a summer work experience; and the core component, the pairing of each student with a knowledgeable mentor, who assists students with career planning, applying to college and learning about the professional work environment. Students targeted are high school juniors who come from low-income families and have average academic and attendance records.

Each local Career Beginnings project raises its own operating expenses with assistance from the national office, which is based at the Center for Human Resources at Brandeis University. Many of the projects receive Job Partnership and Training Act (JPTA) funds as well as support from local businesses and foundations.

Mathematics, Engineering, Sciences Achievement (MESA)

MESA was the brainchild of a California State University faculty member and an Oakland school teacher concerned about the underrepresentation of minorities in engineering. Started 20 years ago with a simple premise that high school students needed to find positive reinforcement and pleasure in the study of math and science, the program grew into a statewide partnership of teachers, engineering faculty, administrators and business executives. Currently, MESA involves 6,300 students at the precollege level and some 3,300 students in undergraduate engineering programs. Some 90 percent of MESA participants go on to four-year institutions; of those, two-thirds declare a math-based major. MESA participants boast an average persistence rate of 61 percent at the college level, a rate three times that of minority students not involved in the program. Even more significant, the number of baccalaureate degrees awarded in engineering to minority students since the college-level program began rose tenfold--from 46 BSEs in 1983 to 460 in 1989.

"For California, this is a serious economic issue," says MESA Director Fred Easter. "Half of the engineers employed in the U.S. are in California. So much of the state's economy depends on industries using engineering manpower. The state cannot afford not to homegrow its own talent. Historically underrepresented minorities are

Hispanic Student Success Program (HSSP)

To combat the dismal college participation and graduation rates of Hispanic students, the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities in 1988 began a pilot program in San Antonio. Funded by the Pew Charitable Trusts, HSSP is a comprehensive, intersegmental project that seeks to improve student motivation and achievement at various points along the education pipeline. It sets specific targets for increasing the high school graduation, college enrollment, and college graduation rates of San Antonio-area Hispanic students. Its individual projects and activities are organized around five functional areas, including activities to foster institutional change; enrichment services for students from kindergarten through college; marketing strategies; training of volunteers, parents and school district staff, and community outreach activities, such as parent forums, that encourage parental involvement.

Enrichment activities consist of an academic year program of field experiences on college campuses for 6th through 9th graders; after-school tutoring of children in grades K-8; a summer enrichment program for 4th and 5th graders; a summer leadership development program for "average" and "at-risk" 7th graders, and an articulation program that seeks to increase the rate at which Hispanic students transfer from two- to four-year colleges.

becoming the lion's share of the population. That group has produced a disproportionately small number of engineers. It must pull its weight so that there will be a pool of manpower to draw from."

At the precollege level, MESA reaches out to students in grades 3 through 12, providing academic enrichment, counseling, and information about college opportunities and financial aid. Program components include courses taught at "Saturday academies," summer residential programs, teacher training, and mentoring experiences provided by college and graduate students as well as engineers and scientists in the workplace. The college program, the Minority Engineering Program, emphasizes support and retention activities that encourage participants to work collaboratively.

The extent to which MESA has been institutionalized can be seen by the fact that it is now a line item in the state budget (roughly $2.5 million per year) and is supported additionally with funds from 95 foundations and corporations nationwide. It is truly a national model; about 20 states have replicated the MESA program, and more are in line to do so.

"HSSP focuses on attitudes and self-esteem," according to Cesar Trimble, HACU vice president and project director of the national HSSP. "Somewhere in middle school the message gets internalized: 'My family, my teachers, my counselors all said I would fail and they're right.' We have to raise self-esteem before we can create achievers."

HSSP has served more than 10,000 students in the San Antonio area in the last two years. A formal program evaluation is being conducted this year. With funding from the Sears Roebuck Foundation, HSSP is being established in Miami, northern New Mexico, Los Angeles, and the Bronx in New York City.

CHAPTER 4

COMMUNITY-BASED PROGRAMS

Individual benefactors and corporate philanthropy, working in tandem with schools, local businesses and community agencies, are renewing attempts to promote academic success and encourage disadvantaged youth to pursue postsecondary education. Some programs are incentive-based and provide direct support to students who meet specific income and academic criteria. The most notable act of individual philanthropy began as a pledge by Eugene Lang to provide college tuition to Harlem sixth graders and turned into a national foundation that is coordinating 125 "I Have a Dream" projects in 25 cities across the country.

Other community-based programs are characterized as "last dollar" scholarships because they fill the gap left between aid provided by various sources and actual college costs. The exemplary programs described below, however, reflect the assumption that students need technical advice as well as financial assistance for college, and in that vein provide help in tracking financial aid sources, filling out financial aid forms, and applying to college. Program staff consider these primary rather than adjunct services. "Counseling is the most critical service, because without it, kids wouldn't be able to wade through the process. Most of our kids are still first generation college students,"

according to Christina Milano, director of finance and administration for the Cleveland Scholarship Programs, Inc.

"Last Dollar" Scholarship Programs: Cleveland, Boston, and Baltimore

The most established program of its kind, Cleveland Scholarship Programs, Inc., has a 23-year history of providing "last dollar" scholarships and other services to disadvantaged students in the Cleveland area. CSP advisers work with interested students of mid-range academic ability to provide information about financial aid sources, help students meet college test and application deadlines and help fill out financial aid forms. "Finalists" eligible for the last dollar grants are chosen on the basis of their ability and financial need. Awards are made during the summer when students have received their aid packages and remaining need can be determined. Once 15 or more CSP students are enrolled on a given campus, the program provides peer counseling and other support for up to five years after high school graduation. In 1989 CSP served 3,800 students and awarded more than $294,000 in scholarships to 721 students.

Since its inception, CSP has provided more than $6 million in grants in seeking aid from federal, state and institutional sources has leveraged its contribution by a ratio of at least 10:1.

A 20-year study of CSP showed that 91 percent of participants surveyed had attended a four-year college, graduated or gone on to graduate or professional school; that more than three-quarters (77 percent) of them had completed college. Among CSP participants who attended four-year colleges, 85 percent of whites and 75 percent of blacks graduated.

In 1987-88, an early awareness component targeted to junior high students was added under the auspices of NASFAA (See Chapter III). The program, which is being monitored over a five-year period, includes campus visits, internships, college fairs, presentations and mailings to parents, and other activities designed to reinforce awareness of postsecondary education opportunities.

In Boston, information and outreach are provided jointly by the Higher Education Information Center, which spearheads early awareness activities under the aegis of the NASFAA project, and the Action Center for Educational Services and Scholarship (ACCESS), which provides last dollar scholarships and counseling to needy Boston students using CSP as a model. These efforts grew out of the well-known school and business collaborative, the Boston Compact. In another facet of the compact, 25 higher education institutions signed an agreement to increase the number of graduates enrolling in postsecondary education in return for better preparation

offered by the schools, and the institutions agreed to support a Higher Education Information Center that would provide general advice on colleges and careers.

The Higher Education Information Center provides information about career and education options to middle school students, typically low-income, through a number of vehicles that include informational material for both students and parents, career introductions, peer advising, workshops held at schools and churches, campus tours, and the like. The Center reaches several thousand in the Boston area every year.

ACCESS was established as a collaborative effort between the Boston public schools and Boston businesses in 1985. ACCESS counselors work with high school seniors to provide assistance in tracking student aid sources, fill out financial aid forms, and interpret award letters they receive. Finalists qualify for last dollar scholarships that range from $200 to $3,000 on the basis of remaining need. Of the 1,500 seniors served last year, ACCESS chose 723 as finalists; of the 429 who completed the process, 116 showed unmet need and received scholarships. The program follows participants to college via an information "hotline" and a monthly newsletter. A survey of the first graduating class last year demonstrated a 79 percent retention rate, according to Nancy Whitcomb, assistant director of the Boston Plan.

A newcomer to these programs, the CollegeBound Foundation of Baltimore, builds on the already established Baltimore Commonwealth, a partnership of the city, local businesses and minority community groups. Modeled after the Boston Compact, the Commonwealth guarantees students who meet academic and attendance requirements job interviews and/or college assistance. It supports a continuum of services for students in grades 6-12 that range from mentoring to college aid. CollegeBound provides the college counseling and scholarship components, working with 4,000 seniors in 16 Baltimore high schools. Last year, the foundation was able to make awards of $200 to $2,000 to all 54 of the applicants who had unmet need, according to Joyce Kroeller, CollegeBound executive director. CollegeBound is halfway toward its goal of raising a $25 million, permanent endowment to fund the scholarship and counseling activities.

Other Philanthropic Initiatives

Foundations for some time have supported school improvement initiatives designed to prevent academic failure for disadvantaged youth, but recently philanthropic endeavors have shifted from being categorical, or program oriented, to more comprehensive programs seeking structural changes in schools and communities.[12] The Ford Foundation, for instance, which has underwritten school reform efforts since the 1950's and has recently focused on dropout prevention, acknowledged that its past

attempts disregarded the broader organizational and social contexts of these problems. Now Ford is spending some $2.3 million to galvanize school and community groups to reduce the dropout rates in 21 cities.[13]

Current foundation initiatives also reflect the new conventional wisdom that successful interventions must begin earlier in adolescence when self-concept and expectations are formative.[14] Over the last four years, for instance, the Lilly Endowment has supported activities to improve urban middle schools and expand educational opportunity in Indiana. Lilly is also embarking on a plan to restructure the guidance programs for youth in eight cities.

Community-Wide Change: The New Futures Project

One of the most comprehensive projects to date is the New Futures Initiative sponsored by the Connecticut-based Annie E. Casey Foundation. In 1988 the foundation launched a five-year, $50 million initiative to support systemic changes in services to disadvantaged youth. The foundation awarded grants of between $5 million and $12.5 million to five cities: Dayton; Lawrence, MA; Little Rock; Pittsburgh, and Savannah, all of which are matching foundation funds. The partnership between the foundation and the cities requires each city to set concrete goals for increasing school attendance, academic achievement and graduation rates. The initiative rests on the

assumptions that schools and community agencies can influence positively the experiences and expectations of at-risk youth and their families; that these institutions must work in tandem; and that entire communities bear the responsibility for change.

The coordinating vehicle in each community is an oversight board known as the Collaborative, composed of state officials, school superintendents, heads of social service agencies, clergy, local business leaders, and college representatives. Each city has also chosen a lead agency for the project--the school district in Dayton, a youth commission in Lawrence, and nonprofit umbrella organizations in the other cities. Although the designed interventions vary from city to city, all share a focus on "case management"--the presence of advocates to link services with students.

"This is a project aimed at getting at the basic, structural reasons kids are having problems," says Cheryl Casciani of the Casey Foundation. "It's trying to get everyone working, with the ultimate goal of improving the success rate for these youngsters and ensuring that more of them graduate with skills."

CHAPTER 5

FEDERAL PROGRAMS

The set of Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds--commonly referred to as the TRIO programs--are authorized by Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. As part of the War on Poverty legislation, the programs were intended as adjuncts to the substantial financial aid programs created to assist low-income students. Implicit in the authorizing statutes was the acknowledgment that financial assistance alone would not guarantee access to higher education for disadvantaged youth.

Authorized in the mid- to late 1960s, the original TRIO programs were three in number--Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Student Support Services--with complementary objectives.[15] Talent Search aims to identify low-income youth with college potential, encourage them to complete high school, and provide information about the availability of financial assistance. Upward Bound, also directed to economically disadvantaged youth, intends to provide clients with the academic skills necessary for pursuing postsecondary education as well as provide information about college choices and financial aid. The Student Support Services program provides similar academic and other special services for low-income or handicapped students already enrolled in college.

45

In the early 1970s, Congress authorized the creation of Educational Opportunity Centers, which are designed to provide financial information and academic assistance to low-income, college-bound adults 19 and older. Staff Development Activities were added later to underwrite training for staff of TRIO programs and improve the quality of the services provided. The newest component of TRIO, added in 1986, the Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement program, supports projects to aid low-income students in pursuing doctoral study. A related program, the School, College, and University Partnerships (also created by the 1986 Amendments), supports collaborative efforts between colleges and high schools to prepare low-income students for either postsecondary education or employment.

In general, the TRIO programs are designed to target disadvantaged youth who are not college bound and prepare them for enrollment in or completion of a college program. The programs award discretionary grants to local higher education institutions or community agencies. Although the individual design varies, the programs generally provide academic counseling, tutoring, and enrichment; information on undergraduate and graduate opportunities and financial aid counseling. The programs' shared rationale is that the cultural and educational deficits of economically disadvantaged youth can be addressed through specific interventions, particularly through the enrichment of academic skills and mentoring, and through access to information that such students typically do not receive from parents or school counselors.

46

Figure 1

TRIO Programs At a Glance

Program	Target Population	Program Objective	Funding	No. Served
TS	Disadvantaged youth 12-27 with exceptional potential for post-secondary education	Encourage pursuit of postsecondary education through information, counseling, financial aid and tutorial services	$ 27.1 mil	197,810
UB	Disadvantaged youth 13-19 (except for veterans)	Generate skills and motivation needed for success beyond high school for low-income, 1st generation college students	$106 mil	38,030
SSS	Disadvantaged or disabled students accepted into or enrolled in college	Provide remedial, other services to students to enable them to start, finish or resume college	$ 90.6 mil	153,300
McNair	Disadvantaged students enrolled in degree program at eligible institution	Provide opportunities for research, scholarly work in preparation for doctoral study	$ 12.1 mil	112,000
Training	Counselors, instructors, TRIO project directors	Provide opportunities for staff development and training to improve delivery of services	$ 1.5 mil.	-----

In the 25 years of their history, TRIO programs have grown from the modest appropriations of several millions to a level of $241.8 million in fiscal 1990 (all programs receive a single, overall authorized appropriation level). During that time, authorizing legislation has extended activities and added programs; expanded funding, and attempted to define more precisely the objectives and beneficiaries of the programs. However, although funding continued to rise, in real terms the programs lost ground during the 1980's. When adjusted for inflation, the fiscal 1990 appropriation falls about 9 percent below 1980 funding (see Table 1).

Thus, although TRIO programs purport to be reaching more students than ever, the services these students receive in some cases has been reduced. Some local projects report they must cut corners to meet their stated goals--either by recruiting volunteers instead of trained personnel, providing services only during the school year instead of yearround, or simply by cutting back the level of service provided. The failure of awards to keep pace with inflation has a disproportionate impact on projects in rural areas that serve a widely dispersed population.

The following sections discuss separately the objectives, legislative history, funding and program design of the TRIO programs, the School, College and University Partnership Program, and the HEP/CAMP programs.

Table 1

Funding of TRIO Programs, 1980-1990

(in thousands of dollars)

Fiscal year	Budget request	Appropriation	Pct. change, from FY 80	Change, adjusted for inflation
1980	$130,000	$147,500	----	----
1981	159,500	156,500	6.1	- 2.9
1982	159,500	150,240	1.9	-14.5
1983	82,251	154,740	4.9	-17.9
1984	35,000	164,740	11.7	-17.4
1985	82,370	174,940	18.6	-17.4
1986	82,370	168,786	14.4	-24.4
1987	82,370	176,370	19.6	-23.8
1988	82,370	205,841	39.6	-15.0
1989	205,841	219,257	48.6	-13.1
1990	228,168	241,822	63.9	- 9.2

Source: Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service, U.S Department of Education: Major Program Trends, Fiscal Years 1980-90 (Washington, D.C.: CRS, 1989), 87 and unpublished data.

Talent Search

Legislative History

The Talent Search program was created by the Higher Education Act of 1965 as an adjunct to Educational Opportunity Grants, with the purpose of assisting disadvantaged youth to pursue postsecondary education. In 1966, the first year that funds were appropriated, 42 projects serving 50,000 clients were supported at a cost of $2 million. In academic year 1989-90, the Education Department awarded $26.1 million for 177 projects, designed to serve more than 200,000 people.

The legislative history of Talent Search suggests a series of efforts to clarify the intended beneficiaries of the program. The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575) added "cultural need" to economic need in defining eligibility and also stipulated that participants must have "exceptional potential" for postsecondary education. The Education Amendments of 1976 (P.L. 94-482) added students in isolated rural areas to the definition of disadvantaged populations; included a focus on students who had delayed applying to college; and authorized up to one-third of TS participants to come from other than low-income backgrounds. The Education Amendments of 1980 (P.L. 96-374) added the current priorities of low-income and first-generation college students and clarified the distinct target populations of TS and Education Opportunity Centers, which are designed to reach adults.

Program Design

Talent Search (TS) targets youth with college potential between the ages of 12 and 27 who have completed the sixth grade. In any project, two-thirds of participants must be both low income and potential first-generation college students. Among the authorized services are: academic, financial, or personal counseling; career exploration and aptitude assessment; assistance in high school or college reentry; information on postsecondary education; on student financial assistance; precollege test preparation; and assistance in completing college applications and student aid forms. About half of TS programs are administered by postsecondary institutions and half by community agencies.

Permitted activities and services under Talent Search are quite broad; nevertheless, because each Talent Search program attempts to reach an average number of 1,000 with a small number of program staff, TS represents a limited intervention. In a TS program in the West, for example, five counselors each have caseloads of more than 200 students in urban areas and on Indian reservations. The amount of contact varies with student needs; in this particular program, seniors make the heaviest claims on services, while staff make contact with younger students as rarely as once a quarter.

Program regulation permits TS projects to serve adults if no Education Opportunity Center exists in the service area. In fact, many, if not most, TS programs do serve adults as well as youth--an issue that may need to be reexamined.

In 1989, the Education Department took steps to extend TS outreach to a younger population. The Department awarded $3 million in supplemental grants to 53 TS projects that would serve seventh and eighth graders as well as students in later grades. In announcing its plan to expand the initiative in 1991, the Department said the initiative gives students "an increased opportunity to complete secondary school and identify appropriate postsecondary educational programs at an younger age."

Outcomes

The College Board's 1985 study of 11 Talent Search projects and annual performance data from the Education Department found merit in individual project efforts but concluded it was impossible to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the program. The report recommended that the Department's performance system be overhauled; it also urged that additional TS funds should be targeted to projects that serve Hispanics, who were underrepresented among TS clients.[16]

Educational Opportunity Centers

Legislative History

The Education Amendments of 1972 established Educational Opportunity Centers, which were originally conceived as clearinghouses of information about financial and academic support that would serve low-income communities. The federal government would pay for 75 percent of project costs. The first round of awards in fiscal 1974 supported 12 EOCs throughout the country at a cost of $3 million. Today, in academic year 1989-90, grants totalling $11.6 million are supporting 40 EOCs nationwide.

During the 1970s, EOC was reauthorized without major program changes. The 1980 Education Amendments set the current eligibility criteria for both TS and EOC to clarify the distinct populations they are intended to serve. EOCs are targeted to serve adults age 19 and older. At the same time, the Amendments permitted the programs to target clients who were lacking appropriate services in their communities. The 1986 Higher Education Amendments removed the 25 percent matching requirement for EOCs.

53

Program Design

EOCs provide assistance and information about postsecondary education to adults 19 and older. At least two-thirds of participants must be low-income, first-generation college students. EOCs may serve younger students if no Talent Search services are available in the area. The authorized program services include: academic, financial or personal counseling; career exploration and assessment, assistance in school or college reentry; information on postsecondary opportunities; information on student financial assistance; pre-college test preparation; assistance in completing college or financial aid applications; coordination with nearby postsecondary institutions, and general community awareness activities.

Outcomes

A 1985 study prepared for the College Board examined six EOCs and concluded that while the individual projects had succeeded in serving large numbers of clients, the overall effectiveness of the program was difficult to gauge. The report outlined specific flaws in the Education Department's recordkeeping and reporting system and recommended that it be overhauled.[17]

Upward Bound

Legislative History

Upward Bound is the oldest of the TRIO programs. Originally established by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575) transferred program authority from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education. Then and now, Upward Bound was intended to provide disadvantaged youth with the preparation and motivation necessary for pursuing postsecondary education. From several pilot projects begun in 1965, Upward Bound has grown in 1989 to a $98 million program supporting 502 projects nationwide.

The program was reauthorized throughout the 1970s without major revisions. The Education Amendments of 1980 detailed the activities (spelled out below) that could be supported under Upward Bound projects; set the first-generation college requirement for eligible beneficiaries, and specified the age range of 13 through 18 for participants with at least eight years of elementary education.

Current program legislation permits the award of stipends to participants of $60 a month during the summer and $40 a month during the school year.

55

Program Design

Upward Bound projects provide instruction in precollege reading, writing, study skills, mathematics and other subjects; academic, financial or personal counseling; exposure to cultural events; tutorial services; information on postsecondary opportunities; information on student financial assistance; assistance in preparing for college admissions tests and completing college applications and financial aid forms; and exposure to a range of careers in which the disadvantaged are likely to be underrepresented. Typically, Upward Bound grantees are colleges and universities or community agencies, although in rare instances high schools may run the program.

Upward Bound participants must be between low-income and potential first-generation college students between ages 13 and 19 (except for veterans) and have completed the eighth grade. As in other TRIO programs, Upward Bound participants are referred by counselors or other staff of "target" or "feeder" schools with large concentrations of low-income students. Timing of the outreach varies. Some Upward Bound programs work mostly with high school juniors or seniors; many, however, work with students for two to four years beginning in ninth grade. During the academic year, participants typically meet once a week with counselors, who monitor academic progress, provide individual or group counseling, and provide tutoring, help with study skills, preparation for SATs or ACTs, or general "college survival skills."

The core of the Upward Bound program is the summer residential component, which allows participants to spend six to eight weeks on a college campus and become acculturated to campus life. Participants live in residence halls and take a range of courses that are described as both academic and cultural. Upward Bound staff describe the experience as pivotal in enabling students to envision themselves as college students. "They begin to lose their discomfort," notes one program director. "College becomes a reality for them."

Because it is the most intensive, focusing resources on a small population, Upward Bound is also the costliest TRIO program on a per student basis. Each program serves about 70 or 75 students at a cost of more than $2,600 per student.

Outcomes

Upward Bound has been evaluated more extensively than other TRIO programs. Research Triangle Institute has conducted a long-term series of studies of Upward Bound. These studies have shown a demonstrably positive effect of Upward Bound on college participation and, less consistently, on postsecondary retention and graduation. Specifically, the most recent RTI followup showed that:

- About 90 percent of Upward Bound participants entered postsecondary education, compared with 72 percent of nonparticipants;

- Some 74 percent of Upward Bound participants enrolled at four-year institutions, compared with the 43 percent rate of nonparticipants; and

- Some 20 percent of Upward Bound students graduated from four-year institutions, compared to 5 percent of nonparticipants.[18]

The study also showed that despite a higher graduation rate, Upward Bound students were also more likely to earn fewer years of credit than nonparticipants.

The General Accounting Office's evaluations of 1974 and 1983 disputed the positive effects of Upward Bound on college retention. GAO noted a high dropout rate of Upward Bound participants at 12 program sites; its 1983 report also cited lack of available data on the postsecondary progress of Upward Bound participants.[19]

A 1985 study prepared for the Applied Systems Institute showed that Upward Bound participants were more likely to obtain financial aid, attend college and persist in college for the year after high school. After 21 months, however, Upward Bound graduates showed retention rates that were not appreciably higher than nonparticipants.[20]

Student Support Services

Legislative History

The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-575) established the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students in order to extend academic support services to disadvantaged youth enrolled in college. The statute spelled out a range of activites that could be undertaken to encourage retention and pursuit of graduate and professional education. These activities were replaced by the phrase "remedial and other special services" in the Education Amendments of 1972 (P.L. 92-318). The Education Amendments of 1980 created the present program structure, including the eligibility requirements that two-thirds of participants must be physically handicapped or low-income, first-generation college students. The Higher Education Amendments of 1986 (P.L. 99-498) renamed the program Student Support Services and added articulation activities to the list of services. These permit funds to be spent on helping students in two-year institutions transfer to four-year institutions.

The program was first funded in 1970, when $10 million was appropriated. Today, in academic year 1989-90, awards totaling $85.4 million are supporting 707 programs and serving more than 140,00 students.

Program Design

The Student Support Services program provides a range of counseling, tutorial, remedial and other services to low-income, first-generation or physically handicapped college students. In addition, participants receive information on graduate opportunities and assistance in securing financial aid for enrollment in gradaute and professional programs. By statute, the colleges and universities that administer these programs must assure that the full financial need of each participant will be met.

The program grants the sponsoring institution great discretion in determining the services provided. In practice, then, observers say, the local projects vary greatly. Some institutions support the full gamut of academic, informational and cultural activities; others focus their efforts simply on remediation or academic advising.

Outcomes

A two-part study by the Systems Development Corporation (1983) found that students receiving the entire range of support services were more than twice as likely to complete their freshman year as nonparticipants; that cultural and other nonacademic services were correlated with greater academic success; that no one type of academic service was more effective than another; and that after the freshman year, academic services were correlated with poor academic performance.[21]

GAO's 1982 evaluation of 11 sites concluded that the Education Department was insufficiently monitoring Student Support Services to assess whether program goals were being met. The Department responded that performance data from 1978-79 through 1980-81 showed that 87 percent of the participants remained in or graduated from school. It also noted SDC's report on the effects of program participation on persistence.[22]

McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement

The Ronald E. McNair Post-Baccalaureate Achievement program was authorized by the Higher Education Amendments of 1986 (P.L. 99-498) to identify and aid disadvantaged students in pursuing graduate education. The statute stipulates that two-thirds of participants must be low-income, first-generation college students; the remainder must come from a group that is underrepresented in graduate education. Programs must be sponsored by an institution of higher education. The statute authorizes a maximum of $1 million in funding in fiscal 1988, rising to $4 million by fiscal 1991.

This newest TRIO program was first funded in fiscal year 1989. The Education Department made 14 awards totaling $1.5 million that will serve about 700 students. The program is designed to provide opportunities for research and scholarship that will

61

effectively prepare students for doctoral work. Authorized services include: stipends for research (up to $2,400); tutorial services; academic counseling; seminars; assistance in obtaining financial aid; and assistance in gaining entry to graduate programs. Because the program is so new, no evaluation has been performed.

School, College and University Partnership Program (SCUPP)

Created by the 1986 Higher Education Amendments, the School, College and University Partnership Program provides grants to two-year and four-year colleges and local education agencies for collaborative projects that boost skills of low-income secondary students and help prepare them for further education or employment. Specifically targeted are educationally disadvantaged students; potential dropouts; pregnant, adolescent and teen parents; and children of migrant workers in grades 7 through 12. In an effort to encourage local institutionalization, the federal contribution declines from 70 percent to no more than 50 percent of costs in the third and subsequent years of each project.

Now in its second year, SCUPP is supporting seven partnerships administered by four-year institutions and four pilot community college projects. The projects typically employ a range of strategies for dropout prevention and college and career and college preparation, including summer enrichment experiences, peer mentoring and tutoring,

62

home counseling, informational workshops, and teacher training. Several are reasonably intensive, serving several hundred or fewer students within a region.

Migrant High School Equivalency Program and College Assistance Migrant Program (HEP/CAMP)

The HEP/CAMP programs are authorized by Sec. 418A of the Higher Education Act. The programs were created in the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, which had broad statutory authority under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-452) to assist migrant and seasonal farmworkers and their families. HEP projects were first funded in 1967, CAMP projects in 1972. The Education Department has administered the programs since 1980.

The Migrant High School Equivalency Program (HEP) is designed to help migrant students earn a high school diploma or its equivalent and prepare for postsecondary education or employment. HEP primarily provides academic instruction and tutoring, as well as support services. To be eligible, students must be migrant or seasonal farm workers or be in a family of migrant workers, must be above the age of compulsory school attendance in the state and must be in need of financial assistance and support services. Three-year grants are awarded to colleges and universities or

63

other public and private nonprofit organizations to administer the projects. Current funding in FY 1990 of $7.8 million supports 22 HEP projects that serve about 3,100 students.

The University of Houston, which has run a HEP project for the last 20 years, recruits HEP students from public school migrant programs in surrounding Houston and in the Rio Grande Valley of south Texas. The project admits 35 students per class to a six-week academic session. About 75 percent of the students are Hispanic, and 20 percent are black, and they range in age from 18 to 24. During the session, participants attend cultural events and make use of the college facilities. Staff from community agencies discuss college opportunities with HEP students, provide information about sources of financial aid and help them fill out application and financial aid forms. At the end of the session, students are given a posttest to assess their progress and are sent to take the GED. More than half obtain the GED; of those, about one-third go on to some form of postsecondary education, according to project director Kobla Osayande.

The College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP) provides financial and other assistance to migrant and seasonal farmworkers enrolled as full-time freshmen to ease the transition to college life. Students receive scholarships for tuition and small cash stipends for living expenses; they are also provided tutoring, counseling, academic

advising and assistance in meeting financial needs during the rest of their college career. Like HEP, students must be a migrant or seasonal farmworker or a migrant worker's dependent and must qualify for financial assistance. Like HEP, CAMP projects are administered by colleges and universities. Currently five projects are being supported at a cost of $1.72 million; the CAMP program serves 280 students.[23]

St. Edwards University in Austin, TX runs the oldest CAMP project (it dates from the program's inception 18 years ago). The project uses CAMP funding to leverage student aid from federal, state and institutional sources--including a required $1,500 loan--to pay the first year's bills and to locate aid for the remaining years. Although students are ineligible for direct help through CAMP after the first year, the university guarantees tuition, with a small self-help contribution, to CAMP students in good academic standing. CAMP students receive tutoring and counseling through CAMP in the first year and rely on institutional support services in subsequent years, according to project director Sarita Rodriguez. St. Edwards admitted 61 students to CAMP in the 1989-90 academic year, although it is proposing to support fewer students in the next funding cycle so it can boost retention of CAMP participants. Historically, 90 percent of the CAMP participants at St. Edwards have completed the first year of college; 70 percent have completed the four-year degree.

Outcomes

The HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project in 1985 assessed the long-range impact of the two programs and concluded that they were successful in meeting their stated objectives. It found that between 1980 and 1985:

- More than four out of five (84.6 percent) HEP students earned a GED;
- One out of five HEP students had completed a two-year or four-year degree;
- More than nine out of 10 (92.4 percent) CAMP students completed at least the first year of college;
- Seven out of 10 CAMP students were currently enrolled in an undergraduate or graduate program, and
- Almost three out of five (56 percent) CAMP students enrolled in 1980 earned four-year degrees.[24]

The report emphasized the importance of postsecondary linkages, noting that campus-based HEP programs were more successful than those without direct affiliations and urging CAMP programs to recruit more HEP graduates.

66

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The foregoing sections have described the features of selected early intervention and outreach programs at the state and local level and charted the history of TRIO, HEP/CAMP and related federal programs that serve similar purposes. Although specific program objectives, funding and delivery differ, it is possible to identify a common set of policy concerns for the programs as a whole.

The funding and scope of TRIO programs have been the subject of ongoing debate. At their most successful, the federal programs reach a fraction of the eligible population that could benefit. According to NASFAA, about 475,000 of the estimated 10 million currently eligible for TRIO programs are being served.[25] A national evaluation of HEP/CAMP concluded that over 20 years, only about three percent of the known eligible population has been served.[26] The per student costs of Upward Bound and HEP/CAMP have been called excessive. One higher education observer sized up federal policy as a compromise agreement to fund an admittedly small population.

Prior questions, however, devolve over issues of appropriate timing and intervention, articulation, coordination, and results. In light of what is now known

about effective intervention and information strategies, the following questions can be posed:

- Do the projects supported by these federal programs reach students soon enough to increase their ability and propensity to pursue postsecondary education opportunities?

By and large, efforts and resources are directed to students age 14 and older, when attitudes, academic orientation, and study habits are already formed. Looking strictly at TRIO, roughly 85 percent of total TRIO funding is allocated to two programs--Upward Bound, which is aimed at high school students, and Student Support Services, directed to college students. The Department's expansion of Talent Search projects to serve 7th and 8th graders indicates a promising shift. In announcing the initiative, the Department acknowledged that "[i]ncreasingly, research studies, national educators and reports ... are calling for targeted dropout prevention efforts at the elementary and middle school levels." It should be noted that less than 2 percent (roughly $3 million) of the total $241.8 million appropriated for TRIO in fiscal 1990 is earmarked for middle school or junior high students.

Support for shifting resources to earlier grades is widespread. "Early outreach isn't early enough," Mills College Upward Bound Director LaWanda McCullom testified before the committee.

> Legislative definitions of target students are no longer responsive to the needs of today's youth. By the fifth grade, students are already identified as college bound and are tracked and provided information and access to Title IV programs based on the perception of their demonstrated potential. ... Legislation needs to be amended to target students as early as the fifth grade. Disadvantaged youth need to be encouraged earlier to prepare to attend college with the expectation that adequate financial assistance is available. [27]

The Quality Education for Minorities (QEM) Project, a national panel of educators, union officials, business leaders and policymakers, recently endorsed extending Talent Search into the middle school grades. Noting TS's track record, the project said that "[b]y intervening even earlier, many students can be reached who otherwise may drop out before reaching senior high school or who may not select appropriate courses to enable them to attend college."[28]

Of the Upward Bound project directors queried for this report, almost all were adamant in the belief that their efforts would also be more effective if targeted to a younger group. Most Upward Bound programs pick up students in the 9th or 10 grade, when aspirations and achievement have already solidified. "At 14, most young people think they're grown," notes one Upward Bound director. "They're set in their ways, and

hard to motivate." Corroborates another UB director, "By the time we reach them, for the most part these students have made their minds up [about their future]. Their track record is already set, and their teachers respond to them accordingly."

- Are the intervention and outreach strategies broad enough to facilitate access to and retention in postsecondary education?

Experience suggests that providing information alone is not enough to promote access to higher education; that a range of academic and support services, directed at both students and families, is necessary. Under the best circumstances, Upward Bound projects represent an intensive set of interventions, one that uses a range of tutoring, counseling, enrichment and role modeling activities to increase students' motivation and ready them for college. From local and national reports, Upward Bound projects appear to be providing the right mix of services to assure participants' entry into college. However, because of its less demonstrable effects on overall college retention and graduation rates, the program has been criticized for placing insufficient emphasis on academic skills.[29]

- To what degree are the TRIO programs coordinated among themselves and with other state or community programs to provide a continuum of support for students as they move through the education system?

70

With the extension of Talent Search, TRIO theoretically provides a continuum of services for disadvantaged students from junior high to graduate school. An informal survey of local TS, Upward Bound, and Student Support Services projects shows coordination among TRIO programs to be the exception rather than the rule. TS, with the objective of providing general information to large groups of students, has neither the orientation nor resources to follow up its clients. Whether any students served by TS later get "picked up" by Upward Bound appears to be a matter of serendipity. Upward Bound staff do help UB participants identify special services at the colleges to which they have been admitted, and are required to do follow-ups, although these may take the form of simply verifying student attendance. There is no guarantee that an Upward Bound graduate will enroll in an institution that runs a federal Student Support Services project or that offers comparable support services of its own. That such students can and do fall through the cracks is apparent from the number of former UB participants that maintain contact with the program after they matriculate because, according to one project director, "they have nowhere else to turn."

Lack of coordination stems from several factors; in any given area, the availability and range of TRIO or other federal programs varies; in most cases, the projects are administered by different providers at different sites. Add to the mix a plethora of state, local and privately sponsored programs operating within their own

niches, and the results are frequently parallel, even duplicative efforts that cumulatively serve a small population. In short, no mechanisms exist for coordinating the federal efforts to ensure a sequence of age-appropriate services for students at different stages in the educational process.

- How effective have the federal programs been in increasing the college participation and retention rates of the populations they serve?

The lack of tracking mechanisms, combined with inconsistencies across programs in the Department's performance reporting system, have made program evaluations difficult and infrequent. Thus, although local success stories abound, the absence of comprehensive program evaluation data makes it well nigh impossible to determine how successfully the TRIO programs have met their goals. This point has been driven home repeatedly by researchers and policymakers studying the programs. The College Board's 1985 study of TS and EOC concluded:

> Because of inadequate data, the type of definitive evaluation these programs deserve is not possible. .... This study indicated that a consistent and comprehensive approach to gathering evidence across projects would strengthen the case for continuing support of these programs and would reveal ways to improve service delivery.[30]

In briefing Congress on policy options for the 1986 HEA reauthorization, the Congressional Research Service declared that "Clearly ...some uncertainty exists about

the actual impact of the various programs. Partly, this uncertainty arises from an absence of recent, comprehensive national studies of each of the programs."

The Department is undertaking a major evaluation of the two largest TRIO programs, Upward Bound and Student Support Services, in the next few years that should provide useful data. This effort is welcomed. It could be accompanied by procedures to make reporting program results more uniform and adequate resources for projects to track their results. Further, the Department could assess how its information and outreach programs in toto help address problems of access and retention for poor and minority students.

ENDNOTES

1. The Washington Office of the College Board, "Trends in Student Aid: 1980 to 1989," (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, August 1989), 13.

2. Reginald Wilson and Deborah J. Carter, Minorities in Higher Education: Eighth Annual Status Report (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1989), 5.

3. Statement of the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, Stanford University, Aug. 14, 1989.

4. National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators and American Council on Education, Certainty of Opportunity: A Report on the NASFAA/ACE Symposium on Early Awareness of Postsecondary Education (Washington, D.C.: NASFAA, 1989), 7-15.

5. Kenneth R. Reeher and Jerry S. Davis, National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs 21st Annual Survey Report, 1989-90 Academic Year (N.P.: NASSGP, 1990), 1.

6. Reeher and Davis, National Association of State Scholarship and Grant Programs 20th Annual Survey Report, 1988-89 Academic Year (N.P.: NASSGP, 1989), 87.

7. Student Access and Success in Ohio's Higher Education System: A Policy Study of the Ohio Board of Regents (N.P.: Ohio Board of Regents, 1988), 55.

8. Commission on Minority Participation in Education and American Life, One-Third of a Nation (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, Education Commission of the States, 1988).

9. Certainty of Opportunity, p. 15.

10. National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, NASFAA Early Awareness Project: Pilot Project Reports and Compendium of Early Awareness Programs in the United States (Washington, D.C.: NASFAA, 1988).

11. Ibid.

12. Lynn Olson, "Donors Seek Deeper, More Lasting Results From Gifts," Education Week, March 2, 1988, 1, 27-28.

13. Ibid.

14. Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development, Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century (New York: Carnegie Corporation, 1989).

15. Unless otherwise noted, the legislative history and program descriptions of the TRIO programs are taken from Congressional Research Service, Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act: Program Descriptions, Issues and Options (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1985) and other CRS documents.

16. Paul L. Franklin, Helping Disadvantaged Youth and Adults Enter College: An Assessment of Two Federal Programs (Washington, D.C.: The Washington Office of the College Board, 1985), 17-19.

17. Ibid.

18. Graham J. Burkheimer et al, Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A Second Follow-Up (Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute, 1979). The high participation rates reported for the control group have been interpreted as evidence that many Upward Bound participants would succeed on their own.

19. U.S. General Accounting Office, "Review of the Upward Bound Program" (Washington, D.C.: GAO, March 18, 1983).

20. Steven M. Jung and Applied Systems Institute, Reanalysis of High School and Beyond Data to Estimate the Impact of Upward Bound (Washington, D.C.: Applied Systems Institute, 1984).

21. Systems Development Corporation, Evaluation of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program: Final Report (Santa Monica, CA: SDC, October 1983).

22. U.S. General Accounting Office, "Department of Education Uncertain About Effectiveness of its Special Services Program" (Washington, D.C.: GAO, November 12, 1982).

23. CAMP projects are located in Texas, California, Oregon, Idaho and Tennesee.

24. Gary L. Riley, HEP/CAMP National Evaluation Project, Research Report No. 3 (N.P.: October 1985), 10-11.

25. Statement of NASFAA to Advisory Committee, Aug. 14, 1989.

26. Riley, op. cit.

27. Statement of LaWanda McCullom, Director of Upward Bound, Mills College, to the Advisory Committee on Student Financial Assistance, Stanford University, Aug. 14, 1989.

28. Quality Education for Minorities Project, Education That Works: An Action Plan for the Education of Minorities (Cambridge, MA: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, January 1990), 62.

29. Gary Natriello, Edward L. McDill and Aaron Pallas, Schooling Disadvantaged Children: Racing Against Catastrophe (New York: Teachers College Press, 1990).

30. Paul L. Franklin, op. cit., p. 16.